

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 35

February 27, 2018

227 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, 328 C 245. . . .	75
<i>Administrative appeal; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that there was lack of substantial evidence in record to support finding that plaintiff violated statute (§ 14-54) that required it to obtain certificate of approval from local authorities for certain location where it displayed motor vehicles; appeal dismissed on ground that certification improvidently granted.</i>	
Doe v. West Hartford, 328 C 172	2
<i>Summary judgment; reliance on statute (§ 52-593a) that operates to render action timely commenced if process to be served is personally delivered to marshal within limitation period and process is served within thirty days of delivery; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly concluded that requirement in § 52-593a (b) that marshal endorse on return of service date on which process was delivered to him was directory rather than mandatory; claim that Appellate Court improperly reversed trial court's decision to grant defendants' motions for summary judgment on ground that admissible evidence properly before trial court was sufficient to create genuine issue of material fact concerning whether plaintiff had delivered process to marshal within applicable limitation period.</i>	
St. Juste v. Commissioner of Correction, 328 C 198	28
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner of immigration consequences of pleading guilty to assault in second degree; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that petitioner's appeal from trial court's denial of habeas petition was moot; whether, in light of petitioner's deportation during pendency of appeal, any practical relief could be provided in connection with assault conviction; whether petitioner's prior conviction of threatening in second degree constituted crime of moral turpitude barring petitioner's reentry into country; collateral consequences doctrine, discussed.</i>	
State v. Panek, 328 C 219.	49
<i>Voyeurism; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's dismissal of charges; whether video voyeurism statute (§ 53a-189a [a] [1]) that requires victim to be not in plain view refers to plain view of defendant or plain view of public generally; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that § 53a-189a (a) (1) plainly and unambiguously referred to plain view of defendant; whether legislature intended not in plain view to refer to plain view of public generally; claim that ambiguity in § 53a-189a (a) (1) should be resolved in defendant's favor under rule of lenity; claim that § 53a-189a (a) (1) was unconstitutionally vague on its face and as applied to defendant's conduct.</i>	
Volume 328 Cumulative Table of Cases	79

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Brady v. Bickford, 179 CA 776.	2A
<i>Intentional infliction of emotional distress; negligent infliction of emotional distress; defamation; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting motion to modify scheduling order and permitting defendants to file motion for summary judgment; claim that defendants waived litigation privilege during argument on their motion for summary judgment and that defendants' waiver operated throughout entire</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>action; claim that it was improper for trial court to construe defendants' midtrial assertion of litigation privilege as ground to exclude evidence to be motion to amend their pleadings to conform to evidence; claim that defendants failed to plead litigation privilege as defense and failed to file motion in limine to preclude certain evidence as required by trial management order; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiffs' intentional infliction of emotional distress claim was barred by applicable statute of limitations; whether statement made by defendant at hearing before quasi-judicial body was relevant to proceedings and, therefore, was absolutely privileged.</i>	
Cliff's Auto Body, Inc. v. Grenier, 179 CA 820	46A
<i>Foreclosure; judgment lien; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment of foreclosure by sale; whether judgment lien was invalid as matter of law; whether trial court in underlying debt collection action lacked power to determine rate of prejudgment and postjudgment interest more than fifteen months after judgment in that action had been rendered where plaintiff failed to file timely motion to open.</i>	
CPC Funding SPE 2, LLC v. S & S Properties, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 909	115A
Frantzen v. Davenport Electric, 179 CA 846	72A
<i>Workers' compensation; subject matter jurisdiction; attorney's fees; claim that Workers' Compensation Commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction to resolve dispute regarding attorney's fees between counsel who serially represent claimant before commission; whether applicable statute (§ 31-327 [b]) authorized commission to adjudicate subject fee dispute; claim that appellant attorney was deprived of his constitutional right to jury trial; whether there is right to jury trial in proceedings before commission.</i>	
Kimberly C. v. Anthony C., 179 CA 856.	82A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court, in awarding joint legal custody of parties' minor child, improperly failed to apply doctrine of collateral estoppel; claim that under the doctrine of collateral estoppel, trial court in dissolution proceeding was bound by facts found in previous proceeding on second restraining order application that defendant was physically, verbally and sexually abusive to plaintiff; whether trial court properly declined to apply doctrine of collateral estoppel; whether issues involved in dissolution action were actually litigated or necessarily determined in proceeding on second restraining order application; whether issues to be determined in both proceedings were identical; whether trial court improperly denied motions for sexual behavior evaluation and substance abuse evaluation for defendant.</i>	
Papagiannis v. Papagiannis (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 909	115A
Rancourt v. Perkins (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 910	116A
Rivera v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 910	116A
State v. Bobe, 179 CA 878	104A
<i>Sexual assault in second degree; risk of injury to child; claim that trial court improperly admitted evidence of defendant's alleged out-of-court statement to victim's mother through testimony of victim; whether admission of challenged statement was harmful.</i>	

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, Publications Director

Published Weekly – Available at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
ERIC M. LEVINE, Reporter of Judicial Decisions
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

State v. Lopez (Memorandum Decision), 179 CA 909	115A
State v. Pecor, 179 CA 864	90A
<i>Robbery in second degree; whether trial court improperly dismissed defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether there was relief that could be afforded to defendant; mootness; whether defendant's claims were barred by doctrine of res judicata; whether defendant's claim that he was deprived of his liberty unconstitutionally was of such import that it should be heard on its merits; whether record was inadequate for this court to review constitutional claims raised in defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence.</i>	
State v. Robert S., 179 CA 831	57A
<i>Criminal violation of protective order; sufficiency of evidence; claim that evidence was insufficient to prove that defendant intended to call home in which victim resided in violation of protective order; unpreserved claim that trial court denied defendant due process at sentencing by relying on unreliable information from victim; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant opportunity to present mitigating evidence at sentencing.</i>	
Toland v. Toland, 179 CA 800	26A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; arbitration; whether trial court properly construed parties' arbitration agreement as unrestricted with regard to alimony and property division; whether trial court correctly declined to engage in more searching review of alimony and property division issues where arbitration submission was unrestricted; whether arbitration agreement expanded scope of judicial review to include factual determinations; claim that arbitrator's award violated public policy and should have been vacated because arbitrator failed to properly apply statutory (§§ 46b-81 and 46b-82) factors regarding how alimony is awarded and property is divided; claim that trial court improperly failed to vacate arbitrator's award pursuant to statute (§ 52-418 [a] [2]) due to evident partiality; claim that arbitrator's admonishments and warnings to plaintiff as to imposition of sanctions demonstrated evident partiality; claim that evident partiality existed because arbitrator failed to inquire into plaintiff's ability to proceed with hearing; claim that arbitrator's award and denial of plaintiff's request for recess amounted to evidence of bias; claim that arbitration award was not mutual, final and definite upon subject matter submitted within meaning of § 52-418 (a) (4) because arbitrator failed to properly apply facts or consider all criteria within §§ 46b-81 and 46b-82; reviewability of inadequately briefed claim that trial court committed plain error by not vacating arbitration award; claim that arbitrator improperly awarded defendant attorney's fees pursuant to statute (§§ 46b-62 and 46b-82).</i>	
Volume 179 Cumulative Table of Cases	117A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries	1B
---------------------	----

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Social Services, Department of	1C
--	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Bar Examining Committee	1D
-----------------------------------	----